



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,057	04/27/2001	Kathleen Riddell Polizzi	68110328.715	1459

23562 7590 11/29/2005

BAKER & MCKENZIE  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
2001 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 2300  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

TANG, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/845,057

Applicant(s)

POLIZZI ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,17,18,20-26 and 28-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,17,18,20-26 and 28-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 10/17/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are now moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.
2. Claims 1, 3-4, 17-18, 20-26, and 28-43 are presented for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-4, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 36-38, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daswani et al. (hereinafter Daswani) (US 2002/0023108 A1) in view of Rangan et al. (hereinafter Rangan) (US 6,802,042 B2).**

4. As to claim 1, Daswani teaches a computer system configured to communicate with a plurality of users through a network interface, wherein at least one of the plurality of users communicates with the network interface through a computer network, the computer system comprising:

a service broker (subscription server, etc.) electrically connected to the network interface (Fig. 2), the service broker controlling a level of access to the computer system by a user (security provisions from a firewall, etc.) ([0014], [0053], [0039], [0044], *Abstract*);

Art Unit: 2195

a job repository electrically connected to the service broker, the job repository comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job, the at least one job having at least one set of job properties, wherein said set of job properties includes a set of input data;

a job server electrically connected to the service broker, the job server configured to execute said at least one job and to produce an output report of the job, wherein the job server is configured to process the set of input data; and

a job event server electrically connected to the service broker, the job event server comprising a computer memory encoded with instructions for dispatching a job for processing on a corresponding job server according to a predefined schedule.

Daswani fails to explicitly teach producing an output report and processing according to a predefined schedule. However, Rangan teaches an internet-connected portal system with multiple servers and a repository with jobs such as retrieving data from a database, preparing report based on retrieved data, processing data according to a predefined schedule and notifying subscribed users (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, etc.*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Rangan with Daswani because this would provide a convenient and effective enhancement to a data summarization service for a user analysis (*col. 3, lines 20-27*).

5. As to claim 3, Daswani ([0058]) and Rangan (*col. 11, lines 48-57, col. 15, line 30, col. 18, lines 35-38*) teach wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define a list of

Art Unit: 2195

users to be notified when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to process said job properties and provide notification to the list of users when the job is executed.

6. As to claim 4, Daswani (*Abstract*) and Rangan (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, etc.*) teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job subscribing users for notification. Daswani and Rangan is silent on having interrupts/exceptions. However, it is well known and obvious for interrupts or exception conditions to be used in Daswani and Rangan's processing system because it would provide control of timing for when notification occur, etc.

7. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

8. As to claims 20-21, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 3-4.

9. As to claim 23, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

10. As to claim 24, Daswani teaches wherein the job properties further define an input form to be provided to a corresponding job server when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to provide a corresponding input form to said at least one user ([0054]).

Art Unit: 2195

11. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Rangan teaches receiving, retrieving, dispatching and processing job requests, wherein jobs are retrieving data from a database, preparing report based on retrieved data, processing data according to a predefined schedule and notifying subscribed users (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, etc.*). Daswani also teaches these limitation in ([0013], [0016], and [0019], *etc.*).

12. As to claims 37-38, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 3-4.

13. As to claim 40, Daswani ([0042], *etc.*) and Rangan (*see Abstract, col. 4, lines 10-28*) teach wherein the job server is connected to at least one back-end database, the method further comprising: retrieving a set of data corresponding to the requested job from a back-end database; and processing the requested job in the job server with the set of data retrieved from the back-end database and the corresponding set of input data so as to produce an output report.

14. As to claims 41-42, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 3-4.

15. **Claims 17, 22, 25-26, 28-35, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daswani et al. (hereinafter Daswani) (US 2002/0023108 A1) in view of**

Art Unit: 2195

**Rangan et al. (hereinafter Rangan) (US 6,802,042 B2), and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 2003/0058277 A1).**

16. As to claim 17, Daswani and Rangan fail to explicitly teach using an SQR job. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page over an internet network communication ([2045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page to the existing network communication system because it is a robust report generator and it also provides a higher-level programming language ([2045]).

17. As to claims 22 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

18. As to claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 (see mappings to references Daswani and Rangan). In addition, Daswani teaches authentication security that is handled in one of the plurality of servers (*Fig. 1*). However, Daswani and Rangan are silent on having the page be dynamic. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using dynamic, real-time web pages in addition to various servers such as an Authentication Server ([1421], [1478], [0256], *etc*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bowman-Amuah to Daswani and Rangan because it would increase the ability to accommodate any changes in data ([0843]).

19. As to claim 28, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 3.
20. As to claim 29, Rangan teaches wherein the notification is provided through e-mail (*col. 17, lines 1-6, etc.*).
21. As to claim 30, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the notification is provided by updating a dynamically updated portal object in a user's portal page (*[0256], etc.*).
22. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.
23. As to claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 29.
24. As to claim 33, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 26 and 30.
25. As to claims 34-35, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.
26. As to claim 39, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 17.
27. As to claim 43, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 17.



*Response to Arguments*

28. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are now moot in view of the new grounds of rejections.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kt  
11/23/05

  
MENG-AI AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2